

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-20, 26, 27 and 29-47 are pending. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 11-20, 26, 27, 29-38 and 40-47 and objected to Claim 39. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-17, 20, 26, 27, 29-31, 33-38, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,666,516 issued to *Combs* ("*Combs*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Claim 1 is directed to a communication system that includes a central processor and a signal processor. The central processor is operable to transmit and receive data packets using a first communication bus, and transmit and receive control packets using the second communication bus. *Combs* does not disclose, teach or suggest each of these limitations.

With regard to Claim 1, Applicants previously argued that *Combs* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a control bus operable to transmit and receive control packets. In response, the Examiner acknowledged that a signal is not a packet, but then went on to argue that "a packet, by its basic definition of a series of bits in a given order, is a series of signals (bits) in fixed positions sent across a communication medium" Office Action, page 18. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's definition of packet and with the Examiner's characterization of a packet as merely a series of signals. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not define a packet in the manner the Examiner has defined a packet, and would understand a packet to include more than simply a series of signals.

As an example of what one of ordinary skill in the art would understand a packet to be, Applicants direct the Examiner to the definition contained in Newton's Telecom Dictionary, which defines a packet as: "1. Generic term for a bundle of data, usually in binary form, organized in a specific way for transmission. The specific native protocol of the data network may term the packet as a packet, block, frame or cell. A packet consists of the data to be transmitted and certain control information. The three principle elements of a packet

include: 1. Header - control information such as synchronizing bits, address of the destination or target device, address of the originating device, length of the packet, etc. 2. Text or payload - the data to be transmitted. The payload may be fixed in length (e.g., X.25 packets and ATM cells), or variable in length (e.g., Ethernet and Frame Relay frames). 3. Trailer - end of packet, and error detection and correction bits.” Newton’s Telecom Dictionary 653 (16th and a Half ed. 2000). A person of ordinary skill in the art would not think that the GPIO signals of *Combs* qualify as packets. If the Examiner continues to rely on the GPIO signals of *Combs* to reject Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite support for the contention that a signal is a packet.

Moreover, if the Examiner’s definition of packet were correct, which Applicants entertain for arguments sake only, then all digital signal transmissions would be packets. Thus the Examiner’s definition of packet would remove all meaning from the term and include many transmissions that are not what a person of ordinary skill in the art would envision as packets. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully contend that *Combs* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a control bus operable to transmit and receive control packets, and that Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from *Combs*.

Claims 3, 4 and 11 each include a central processor that is operable to transmit data packets and control packets. As discussed above with regard to Claim 1, *Combs* does not disclose, teach or suggest that control packets are transmitted or received using the control bus of *Combs*. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 3, 4 and 11 are each patentably distinguishable from *Combs*.

Claims 26, 33 and 36 each include limitations related to the transmission of control packets over a communication bus. As discussed above with regard to Claim 1, *Combs* does not disclose, teach or suggest transmission of control packets over a bus. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 26, 33 and 36 are each patentably distinguishable from *Combs*.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 12-17, 20, 27, 29-31, 34-35, 37-38, 44 and 46 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 26, 33, or 36. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above with regard to their respective base claims, Applicants respectfully

contend that Claims 2, 5, 9, 12-17, 20, 27, 29-31, 34-35, 37-38, 44 and 46 are each patentably distinguishable from *Combs*.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Combs*. Claims 7, 8, 18, 19 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Combs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,179 issued to Whitridge et al. ("*Whitridge*"). Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Combs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666,366 issued to Malek et al. ("*Malek*"). Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Combs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,506,932 issued to Holmes et al. ("*Holmes*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Each of these rejections is based upon a mischaracterization of *Combs*. As discussed above with regard to Claim 1, *Combs* does not disclose, teach or suggest the transmission or receipt of control packets. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 32, 45 and 47 are each patentably distinguishable from the references cited by the Examiner, in support of the rejected claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants believe no fees are due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Luke K. Pedersen
Reg. No. 45,003
PHONE: (214) 953-6655

Date: April 15, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer No.: 05073